RECEIVED FOR SCANNING VENTURA SUPERIOR COURT

OCT 13 2020 (

Robert B. Mobasseri (SBN 193193)
David Alan Cooper (SBN 190203)
DCooper@MobasseriLaw.com

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT B. MOBASSERI, PC

1055 West 7th Street, Suite 2140 Los Angeles, California 90017

Tele: (213) 282-2000 | Fax: (213) 282-3000 E-Service: EService@MobasseriLaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, MICHAEL GIDDENS and STEPHANIE GIDDENS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA

MICHAEL GIDDENS and STEPHANIE GIDDENS,

Plaintiff,

VS.

TILLY'S MARINE, INC.; BRUNSWICK CORPORATION; FIFTH THIRD BANK, N.A.; and DOES 1 through 100, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Violation of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, Civ.C § 1790 et seq.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

ByFAX

MICHAEL GIDDENS and STEPHANIE GIDDENS ("Plaintiff") allege:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. This matter involves the sale of a defective new boat which the responsible parties have been unable to repair under warranty. The consumer "lemon laws" apply to this type of transaction. Dealer which sold the boat is TILLY'S MARINE, INC. Manufacturer which manufactured and/or distributed the vehicle is BRUNSWICK CORPORATION a Delaware corporation registered with the California Secretary of State to conduct business in California. Lender which financed Plaintiff's acquisition, took assignment of the subject acquisition

1

- 2. Venue is proper because Dealer is principally located at 935 E. Front Street; Ventura, California 93001.
- 3. Plaintiff does not know the true names and capacities, whether corporate, partnership, associate, individual, or otherwise, of defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and thus names them under the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are in some manner responsible for the acts, occurrences, and transactions set forth herein, and are liable to Plaintiff. Plaintiff will set forth the true names and capacities of the fictitiously named defendants together with appropriate charging allegations when ascertained. All acts of corporate employees/agents as alleged below were authorized or ratified by an officer, director, or managing agent of the corporate employer/principal.
- 4. Plaintiff rightfully rejects and/or justifiably revokes acceptance of the subject boat and exercises Plaintiff's right to cancel the subject transaction. Manufacturer and Dealer have failed to repurchase or replace the Boat, and that failure is "willful" as such term is defined within the applicable statutes herein.
- 5. On November 17, 2018, Plaintiff purchased from Dealer a new 2018 Harris Cruiser 220 boat built by Manufacturer bearing Serial # HAMP3732818 ("Boat"). As reflected in the purchase contract, the price before finance charges was \$45,082.26.
- 6. The Boat was sold with an express warranty from the Manufacturer, for which Dealer was an authorized retailer and distributor in California. The express warranty covered most components of the Boat for five years, including the defective components identified herein.
- 7. Because the Boat was sold with an express warranty, the Boat was also sold with a statutory implied warranty of merchantability for which both Dealer and Manufacturer are liable, as described within The Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act at Civil Code Section 1792. The implied warranty of liability promises a California consumer of retail goods for personal or household use that the goods are in safe condition and substantially free of defects and that the goods are fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are to be utilized.

8. Unfortunately, the Boat was sold with a defect which Dealer and Manufacturer have not been able to resolve despite multiple warranty repair presentations. The Boat was advertised to Plaintiff as being able to cruise at speeds in excess of 35 mph and, in fact, performed as advertised at the beginning of Plaintiff's ownership. Yet, the Boat is unable to cruise at speeds of more than approximately 2/3rd of that. Plaintiff presented the Boat to Dealer in August 2019 for inspection and diagnosis of the Boat's lack of speed. Dealer asserted that the Boat was operating normally; yet, Plaintiff continued to observe unacceptably low speed. Plaintiff presented the Boat to Dealer again in June 2020 and again in August 2020 in an attempt to obtain warranty repairs to restore the Boat's speed. Those times, Dealer acknowledged but was unable to correct the power loss issue. Dealer even replaced propulsion parts in an effort to resolve the lack of speed. Yet, the Boat continued to malfunction in the same way. The power-loss malfunction is apparently unrepairable.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, Civil Code Sections 1790 et seq.

(Against Dealer, Manufacturer, Lender and Does 1 to 100)

- 9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 10. Pursuant to the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act at Civil Code § 1790, et seq., the Boat constitutes "consumer goods" purchased or leased primarily for family or household purposes.
- 11. At the time of sale or lease, the defendants were in the business of selling Boats to retail buyers. However, at the time of sale, the Boat suffered from significant defects and non-conformities which later were not repaired under warranty despite repeated presentations, which have rendered the Boat unmerchantable.

- 12. Plaintiff files this action within four years of Plaintiff's inability to obtain repairs under the express warranty and within four years of Plaintiff's discovery that the Boat was unmerchantable at time of sale.
- 13. Plaintiff elects and demands from Manufacturer restitution of all monies paid for the Boat (downpayment, monthly payments, finance charges, taxes, registration, and other incidental and consequential expenses), plus reimbursement, plus additional forms of recovery permitted by Commercial Code Sections 2711, 2712 and 2713, including inspection and transportation costs, plus civil penaltics, attorney's fees and other litigation costs, pursuant to Civil Code Sections 1793.2(d) and Section 1794 for express-warranty violations.
- Plaintiff also elects and demands from Dealer and Manufacturer jointly reimbursement of the purchase price and rescission of the purchase or lease agreement plus the recovery permitted by Commercial Code Sections 2711, 2712 and 2713, including inspection and transportation costs, plus attorney's fees and other litigation costs, pursuant to Civil Code Section 1794(b) for impliedwarranty violations.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- 1. For actual, incidental and consequential damages and restitution from all Defendants, and then as against Manufacturer only, civil penalties;
- For rescission and other appropriate injunctive relief;
- 3. For pre-judgment interest at the maximum legal rate;
- 4. For reasonable and statutory attorney's fees and other costs of suit;
- 5. Any other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

24

25

26

27

Dated: October 9, 2020

LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT B. MOBASSERI, PC

By:

David Alan Cooper

Attorneys for Plaintiff, MICHAEL GIDDENS and

STEPHANIE GIDDENS

28